Pages 1 - 11

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable James Donato, Judge

MAXIMILLIAN KLEIN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

VS.) NO. C 20-08570 JD

META PLATFORMS, INC.,

Defendant.

San Francisco, California Thursday, October 20, 2022

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs:

QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 865 South Figueroa Street - 10th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017

BY: KEVIN Y. TERUYA, ATTORNEY AT LAW
BRANTLEY I. PEPPERMAN, ATTORNEY AT LAW

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN PLLP IL 100 Washington Avenue S - Suite 2200 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

BY: KYLE POZAN, ATTORNEY AT LAW

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP 715 Hearst Avenue - Suite 300 Berkeley, California 94710

BY: HANNA SONG, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

REPORTED BY: Marla F. Knox, CSR No. 14421, RPR, CRR, RMR United States District Court - Official Reporter

1	APPEARANCES:	(cont'd)	
2	For Plaintiffs	3:	
3			LEVIN SEDRAN and BERMAN LLP 510 Walnut Street - Suite 500
4		BY:	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
5			BATHAEE DUNNE LLP
6			901 South MoPac Expressway Barton Oaks Plaza I - Suite 300
7		BY:	Austin, Texas 78746 BRIAN J. DUNNE, ATTORNEY AT LAW
8			BATHAEE DUNNE LLP
9			445 Park Avenue - 9th Floor New York, New York 10022
10			YAVAR BATHAEE, ATTORNEY AT LAW
11	For Defendant:	:	WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING, HALE
12			& DORR LLP 2600 El Camino Real - Suite 400
13		BY:	Palo Alto, California 94306 SONAL N. MEHTA, ATTORNEY AT LAW
14		21.	WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING, HALE
15			& DORR LLP 7 World Trade Center
16			250 Greenwich Street New York, New York 10007
17		BY:	DAVID Z. GRINGER, ATTORNEY AT LAW
18			WILMER, CUTLER, PICKERING, HALE & DORR LLP
19			1875 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, D.C. 20006
20		BY:	MOLLY M. JENNINGS, ATTORNEY AT LAW
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Thursday - October 20, 2022 1 10:58 a.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 THE CLERK: Calling civil matter 20-8570, Klein, et 4 5 al. versus Meta Platforms, Incorporated. 6 Counsel, please come forward and state your appearance. 7 MR. TERUYA: Good morning, Your Honor, Kevin Teruya and my colleague Brantley Pepperman from Quinn Emanuel for 8 consumer Plaintiffs. 9 MR. DUNNE: Good morning, Your Honor, Brian Dunne, and 10 11 I'm joined by my colleague Yavar Bathaee and Keith Verrier for the advertiser Plaintiffs. 12 13 MS. SONG: Hannah Song on behalf of the consumer Plaintiffs. 14 15 THE COURT: For who? 16 MS. SONG: On behalf of the consumer Plaintiffs. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, Your Honor, Kyle Pozan, also MR. POZAN: 18 19 on behalf of the consumer Plaintiffs. 20 MS. MEHTA: Good morning, Your Honor, Sonal Mehta, David Gringer and Molly Jennings on behalf of the Defendant, 21 Meta Platforms, Inc. 22 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Who is going to take 23 the lead on the Plaintiffs' side? 24 25 MR. TERUYA: I am, Your Honor, Kevin Teruya from Quinn

Emanuel. 1 Okay. All right. We are just going to a 2 THE COURT: clear the decks here. The scheduling order -- well, 2025 is 3 just too far out. Just -- just come up with something that has 4 trial in 2024. If you want more time, that's fine, but I 5 just -- you need -- it is just too far away. 6 7 MR. TERUYA: We will do that, Your Honor. THE COURT: This is a 2020 case. This is not an MDL. 8 I'm not saying it is an easy case by any means, but it is not 9 the most complicated seen -- I have ever seen. Five years for 10 11 trial is just beyond the pale. Now, I know I quess I already put a marker on the table 12 13 for 2024, which I'm regretting, so try to stay around that time; okay. How about a week for that? You want to send me 14 15 another one in a week? 16 MR. TERUYA: Yes, Your Honor. Yes, Your Honor. 17 MS. MEHTA: THE COURT: Make it a joint proposal. 18 All right. Now, what is happening with the FTC? This is 19 the whole sitting in on the depos. 20 Plaintiffs, let me just ask you this: What do you think 21 is the degree of factual overlap between your case and the 22 FTC's case? 23

MR. TERUYA: Your Honor, we believe there is some degree of overlap, but the claims and conduct at issue are

24

25

different speaking as to the consumer case.

THE COURT: Can you tell me more.

MR. TERUYA: Sure. The FTC case is focused primarily now on the acquisitions of Instagram and WhatsApp and other companies.

Our case is focused on Facebook's collection and use of data and whether there was a deception in the marketplace as to that conduct which caused Facebook to become a monopolist and thereby to harm competition over that kind of practice; thereby reducing the level of compensation in the market for the collection and use of data.

THE COURT: What about the ads people? What is the overlap between FTC and the ads claims?

MR. TERUYA: Very minimal, I would say, as far as it's different markets.

THE COURT: Okay, I just don't understand why you want to sit in. I mean, I'm not hearing an overwhelming case about they are so similar you should just sit in on all these depos. You can get the transcripts; right?

MR. TERUYA: Yeah, Your Honor, we wanted the opportunity to be able to see them. There was, for example, last week a deposition on data collection and use.

So we weren't planning to sit in on all of them, but we wanted the opportunity to sit in on ones that mattered so we could hear in real-time what's happening; but to Your Honor's

suggestion of transcripts or videos -- transcripts and videos and exhibits, if we can't sit in, we would at least ask in the alternative that we be provided immediately after a deposition with a copy of the transcript, exhibits and video.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, not for everyone, just ones you identify; right?

MR. TERUYA: Ones we identify if we are told the list of here is what is coming up and who they are.

THE COURT: That sounds reasonable.

MS. MEHTA: Your Honor, I think from our perspective if there are particular depositions of people in the FTC case that they want to have deposition transcript for, we are happy to entertain those requests.

I don't know yet what the overlap in witnesses are going to be in terms of people they might actually have an interest in. Very few depositions have taken place in the FTC case. I think it is only one or two and they're 30(b)(6) on specific topics.

We are happy to have that conversation with them. The other thing we've told them is we are happy to talk to them about actual coordination, which is where there is a witness that is subject to deposition in both cases because there is overlap with respect to market --

THE COURT: No, I understand. I'm not going to carve up eight hours. They get their own time. So, that -- I mean,

if you can work out two full days, that's fine; but I'm not -first of all, the FTC case is not mine, so I'm not going to
order anybody in that case to do anything.

In our case, this case, I'm not going to limit the Plaintiffs to four hours for splitting. So, if you want to coordinate so that you take it the day after or the day before and you get your full seven hours, that's fine. It is not going to be a time splitting thing.

All right. So, you-all are going to work that out by exchanging transcripts on a periodic -- you know, not everybody, just who you like, okay, and have some reason for it.

MR. TERUYA: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Meaning something related to this case.
Okay.

Also, the market tutorial, I want to do that the first quarter of next year. So, get yourselves together and figure out how you want to do that. Thinking about maybe mid-February or somewhere around there. Let's get that lined up.

MS. MEHTA: Your Honor, would you like us to put that in the proposed schedule that we submit a week from today -- a proposed --

THE COURT: You can just give me some dates. We will probably -- I will probably do it -- you know, I don't want to go more than two hours, an hour per side. It is not that

complicated. An hour per side. It will be off the record.

It will be like a patent tutorial. It will be off the record. Can't be used against anybody -- I call these my tutorial Miranda rights -- can't be featured in a deposition or a motion to me. I really prefer not having lawyers. I would like somebody else like business people at Meta. You know, I don't know who you are going to use maybe -- I prefer not to have experts.

I don't want paid spokespersons. I would like to have people who understand this on a day-to-bay basis. Plaintiffs, it might be more difficult for you. That's what I would like, so see what you can do.

MS. GROVES: Your Honor, may I ask a clarification question, which is --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. MEHTA: -- are you envisioning -- when we met with you in August, I had understood -- and I may be misunderstanding -- but I understood that you were envisioning an expert hot tub with respect to market definition. Do you want a tutorial --

THE COURT: That is an on-the-record proceeding that I will use in connection with motions, like Daubert, maybe class cert, whatever is happening. This is different. This is like a little tutorial. Just call it education for the Judge day.

MS. MEHTA: Understood.

1 THE COURT: That's what I'm talking about.

MR. TERUYA: Your Honor, to clarify as to this proceeding, for the Plaintiffs, I mean, so lawyers could come and present information to you? Is that the --

THE COURT: I prefer -- look, I'm not going to take arguments. And if people start arguing the case, I will just have you sit down and you will lose your opportunity.

I want an unvarnished description of each side's understanding of what the relevant product market is and how it works. Okay.

I don't want anyone coming in and start talking about, you know, how Facebook has rigged the market for ads and here is the -- we are not doing that. I want -- you know what you should do? Look at my standing order on patent tutorials and do the same thing.

And I would like -- I have one-week joint statement ahead of time so I kind of know -- I have a little bit of a roadmap. Let's do that. Follow my patent tutorial rules, okay, but just pick a couple of dates, you know, mid to end February; and I will pick one that's good for me. Do it on a Tuesday. All right. Tuesdays. I'm going to specially set you for Tuesdays.

MR. TERUYA: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. TERUYA: Would there be a separate session -- one-hour session for the advertiser case and a separate

```
one-hour session, maybe back-to-back, for the consumer case
 1
     given the differences in the cases? I'm happy to --
 2
              THE COURT: Are you alleging separate markets?
 3
              MR. TERUYA: Yeah. So advertisers are individuals and
 4
 5
    businesses who buy advertising on Facebook.
 6
          Consumers are just regular people who use the Facebook
     website or applications on their phone.
 7
          So there are different markets, different parts of
 8
     Facebook business -- Facebook's business and also different
 9
10
     claims, different --
              THE COURT: I don't want to do four hours, so I will
11
     give you half an hour each; and, Facebook, you can have half an
12
    hour each; okay. So it will be two hours total, but it will be
13
     half, half, half, half or something like that.
14
15
              MS. MEHTA:
                         Understood.
16
              THE COURT: Actually, I think it is thirds. But, you
17
    work it out; okay. All right.
18
          Okay. Pastor Jeon, let's leave the poor man alone. He is
     out of the case. He is not a class member, so there will be no
19
20
     deposition of Pastor Jeon.
21
                         (Pause in proceedings.)
22
              THE COURT:
                         Let's see. Okay. I think that was it.
23
    Anything else, Plaintiffs?
              MR. DUNNE: Not from advertiser Plaintiffs,
24
     Your Honor?
25
```

```
THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                                 Defendants?
 1
                          No, Your Honor, nothing further.
 2
              MS. MEHTA:
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. Great. Thanks for coming.
 3
              MR. TERUYA: Thank you, Your Honor.
 4
 5
              MR. DUNNE:
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: File that within a week.
 6
 7
              MS. MEHTA:
                         Your Honor, sorry one last question.
     Should we also or would it be okay if we also propose a date
 8
     for the next status conference with Your Honor in the
 9
10
     submission that we make next --
11
              THE COURT: Are we doing 90 days?
                         We have been doing about every two to
12
              MS. MEHTA:
     three months, I think. It has been a little ad hoc.
13
     either propose a date or you can --
14
15
              THE COURT:
                          I will set one. Just remember, cancel it
16
     if nothing needs to come up. Okay.
17
              MS. MEHTA:
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
18
              MR. TERUYA: Thank you.
                  (Proceedings adjourned at 11:09 a.m.)
19
20
                                ---000---
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. DATE: Monday, October 24, 2022 Marla Krox Marla F. Knox, CSR No. 14421, RPR, CRR, RMR United States District Court - Official Reporter